

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/784,094	02/16/2001	Roger Pellenc	P20520	3219
7055	7590 01/08/2003			
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.			EXAMINER	
1941 ROLAN RESTON, VA	ND CLARKE PLACE A 20191		MAMMEN, NATHAN SCOTT	
	•		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3671	- , , ,
			DATE MAILED: 01/08/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

·	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Advisory Action	09/784,094	PELLENC ET AL.	\mathcal{N}				
, attiony motion	Examiner	Art Unit					
v	Nathan S Mammen	3671	P				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
THE REPLY FILED 26 December 2002 FAILS TO PLAC Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appear Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica) a timely filed amendment whicl I (with appeal fee); or (3) a timel	ation. A proper reply n places the applica	y to a ition in				
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]						
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offic timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejecting FINAL REJECTION. R 1.136(a) and the approper of the fee. The appropriationally set in the final	on. See MPEP opriate extension opriate extension Office action; or				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in . 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.							
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:							
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);							
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);							
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the							
issues for appeal; and/or							
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claim	S .				
NOTE:	on(o):						
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti	on(s)						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).							
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NO	T place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were	e newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected:							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
8. \square The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapp	roved by the Exami	ner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	-					
10. Other:							

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: while the examiner did agree to reconsider the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, the request for reconsideration fails to address the substance of the rejection. Applicant misconstrues the substance of the interview between Applicant and examiner: the examiner's position was that the claims are so void of clear and specific limitations such that the van der Lely '519 patent reads on the instant invention. Applicant is improperly attempting to read limitations of the specification into the claims.

Thomas B. Will Supervisory Patent Examiner Group 3600